

REMARKS

The Office action of March 10, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully noted.

In Figure 7, redundant flow process numeral ``S33'' has been changed to ``S37''.

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Claims 17-19 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 1-2, 7, 9-10, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over prior art disclosed by applicants (Toshihiko JP 10-240774). Claims 3-6, 8, 11-14, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toshihiko. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, and request allowance thereof in the continuation prosecution application for the following reasons.

Substance of Examiner Interview

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the courtesy extended to Applicants' representative by the Examiner during the interview conducted on April 21, 2004.

Applicant and Examiner discussed the allowability of independent claim 1 in view of the prior art cited, Toshihiko. The examiner maintained the rejection of the last office action mailed

March 10, 2004 for this claim based on the view that FIG. 31 discussed in the Applicant's disclosure is prior art.

In response to the maintained rejection, representative contended that FIG. 31 is not prior art, but is part of Applicants' concept of the invention similar to FIG. 32 which was previously agreed to as not constituting prior art. In response to this contention, Examiner agreed to review the disclosed art, Toshihiko, to determine if FIG. 31 is part of the disclosure of the cited art.

The Claims are Patentable Over the Cited References

Claims 1-2, 7, 9-10, and 15 are not anticipated by Toshihiko

Claims 1-2, 7, 9-10, and 15 stand rejected under § 102(b) in view of Toshihiko. Applicants strongly contend that Toshihiko fails to disclose the features recited in these claims as amended such as a macro event definition unit which defines a macro event, including at least a first event and a last event related to each other, and having a time width, equivalent to a range between a beginning of the at least first event to an end of the last event, by using the generation time and contents of the event, and a macro event data creation unit which creates macro event data by structuring the at least first event and the last event from a plurality of event data generated by said event data creation unit based on definition contents of the macro event defined by said

macro event definition unit allowing dependent storage and retrieval of the at least first event and the last event.

Throughout the disclosure of Toshihiko, there is no mention of this patentably distinct feature. Toshihiko solely discloses a data gathering method and device that digitally records video and audio data for later retrieval and playback. In contrast to the recited feature, there is no mention in Toshihiko of a macro event data creation unit that structures at least a first event and a last event related to each other to allow dependent storage and retrieval of the at least first event and the last event. Applicants strongly contend that creating a macro event by structuring at least a first event and a last event related to each other to allow dependent storage and retrieval of these events is significantly different from solely recording video and audio events independent from each other and then playing back the recorded events independent from each other as disclosed by Toshihiko.

Therefore, Toshihiko clearly fails to disclosed the recited feature of a macro event data creation unit which creates macro event data by structuring at least a first event and a last event related to each other from a plurality of event data generated by said event data creation unit based on definition contents of the macro event defined by said macro event definition unit allowing

dependent storage and retrieval of the at least first event and the last event as recited making the claimed invention patentably distinct from the cited reference.

Claims 3-6, 8, 11-14, and 16 are not made obvious by Toshihiko

Claims 3-6, 8, 11-14, and 16 stand rejected under § 103(a) in view of Toshihiko. As contended above, Toshihiko fails to disclosed the patentably distinct feature of a macro event definition unit which defines a macro event, including at least a first event and a last event related to each other, and having a time width, equivalent to a range between a beginning of the at least first event to an end of the last event, by using the generation time and contents of the event, and a macro event data creation unit which creates macro event data by structuring the at least first event and the last event from a plurality of event data generated by said event data creation unit based on definition contents of the macro event defined by said macro event definition unit allowing dependent storage and retrieval of the at least first event and the last event as recited making the claimed invention patentably distinct from the cited reference.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and remarks submitted above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the remaining claims are allowable and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Clint Gerdine (Reg. No. 41,035) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By Clint Gerdine
Clint A. Gerdine, #41,035

CAG:tm
2611-0128P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

Attachment: One (1) Replacement Drawing